



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1890
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,680	12/31/2003	Andrew J. Polcha	IQB-0015 (2203.0015C)	1992
27896 7590 04/19/2007 EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC 1901 RESEARCH BOULEVARD SUITE 400 ROCKVILLE, MD 20850			EXAMINER WILLIAMS, KENT L	
			ART UNIT 2139	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/748,680	Applicant(s) POLCHA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kent L. Williams	Art Unit 2139	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-89 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-89 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>16 January 2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. The claims to Provisional Applications Nos. 60/470,204 and 60/436,996 have been noted. However, the subject matter contained within the Provisional Applications is only pertinent to a select few of the claims. Only the claims that the subject matter converses will be awarded the Provisional filing dates if such discrimination is necessary.

Drawings

1. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the filed hand drawings do have formal drawing counterparts that should be included with the application. If said formal drawing counterparts are inadequate, applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 16 January 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document;

Art Unit: 2139

each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. "Intelligent Biometric Techniques in Fingerprint and Face Recognition" by Jain, L.C. has been placed in the application file as it was obtainable, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "May programmed" should be "may be programmed" on page 15, line 1. There is an error in the Application number found on page 18, line 18. "May be" should be "may" on page 20, line 16. The Examiner believes that the inclusion of "refraction," found on line 2 of page 22, is in error (as a refractive property would inhibit the attainment of the image passing there through).

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code that is found on page 15, line 1, page 16, line 4, page 17, line 9 and page 22, line 14. Please see MPEP §608.01.

5. The serial numbers of the applications presented within the "Reference to Related Applications" are absent.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 59, 61, 67, 69, 78 and 80 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims in question all recite "another one of the unique identity attributes," which is indefinite regarding either antecedent basis in terms of which 'unique identity attribute' is referred to or if it is an additional 'ID attribute.'

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 35, 58, 66, 77, 88 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims recite "detecting," "comparing," and "determining." However, the claims fail to evidence a tangible result, where said steps could be conducted as a mere thought process and therefore lacking any physical attributes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-24, 27-51 and 54-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ratha, N.K. et al. "Enhancing Security and Privacy in Biometric-based Authentication Systems."

Claims 1 and 35 (method and system thereof). An identification method, comprising: detecting a distorted biometric...; comparing....; and determining... [Page 618, ¶2, "To authenticate...acquisition variables" in conjunction with Page 629, ¶2, "In order to alleviate...cannot be recovered."].

Claim 2-3. [Page 614, ¶4, "Biometrics is a rapidly advancing field that is concerned with identifying a person based on his or her physiological or behavioral characteristics. Examples of automated biometrics include fingerprint, face, iris and speech recognition." Please note that the iris forms an 'eye pattern,' which is used for authentication.]

Claim 4. [Figure 10 shows an image through a non-linear lens (either in physical or signal space).]

Claim 5-7. [Page 630, ¶2, "An example of a transform...particular enrollment," where diffraction grating is one embodiment of a perturbation in "the same

physical space as the original.” Page 629-630, ¶4, “Examples of...22 and 23” shows claim 6 ‘electronically generated.’]

Claims 8-9. [Page 614, ¶4 for fingerprint biometric, and Page 630, Page 614, ¶2, “An example of a transform...in Figure 12.”]

Claims 10-14. [Page 630, ¶2, “An example of a transform...as the original,” where teaching perturbations within the same physical space teaches the use of a mask, a lens, or any other object/template capable of perturbing any image and any of its features. It should be noted that the paragraph also outlines such perturbations in the image processing or signal space.]

Claims 15-24. [Rejected per claims 10-14 in conjunction with Page 614, ¶Abstract, “Although, for illustrative purposes, fingerprint authentication is used throughout, our analysis extends to other biometrics-based methods.” Please note that a ‘mask pattern’ is a perturbation of the image or a “...repeatable noninvertible distortion to the biometric (Page 633, last paragraph).”]

Claims 27. [Page 628, ¶4, “Deploying biometrics...commercial enterprises” in conjunction with Page 629, ¶2, “In order to alleviate...biometrics cannot be recovered.”]

Claims 28-29. [Page 632-634, ¶2-3, “When employing cancelable...added to prevent such misuse,” teaches *all forms* and locations of template/biometric storage.]

Claims 30. [Page 616, ¶5, “In the final stage...legally binding evidence of identity.”]

Art Unit: 2139

Claim 31-32. [Table 1.]

Claim 33. [The Examiner wishes to take official notice that a “lens included in an eyepiece carried by [a] person” is well known (in general) as “glasses” or “spectacles.”]

Claim 34. [Figure 13.]

Claims 36-57. [Rejected per their respective claims 2-34.]

Claims 58 and 66 and 77 (method and system thereof and computer-readable medium embodiment thereof). An identification method, comprising:

Receiving a signal indicative of a combination of two or more unique identity attributes, at least one of the unique identity attributes corresponding to a biometric of a person [Page 629, ¶2, “In order to alleviate...biometrics cannot be recovered” where the “transform function” is a identity attribute, which is evidenced by Page 633, ¶1, “Alternatively, for the best...prevent such misuse” showing that the “transform function” is synonymous with a password that is combined with the biometric identity.]; comparing...; and determining... [Page 618, ¶2, “To authenticate...acquisition variables.”].

Claims 59-65, 67-76 and 78-84. [Rejected per their respective claims 2-34.]

Claims 85-87. [Page 632, ¶2, “When employing...institution for processing,” where teaching storing digital data teaches storing said data on all well-known media such as CD-ROM (optical), hard disk (magnetic) or at the transistor-level (IC chip).]

Claims 88 and 89 (method and system thereof). A method for identifying a person, comprising:
generating an encoded biometric [Page 616, ¶3, "Fingerprints are a distinctive...referred to as *minutiae*." "Digitizing" a fingerprint is encoding.];
detecting the encoded biometric; comparing...; and determining... [Page 618, ¶2, "To authenticate...acquisition variables" in conjunction with Page 629, ¶2, "In order to alleviate...cannot be recovered."]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2139

13. Claims 25, 26, 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratha, N.K. et al. "Enhancing Security and Privacy in Biometric-based Authentication Systems."

Ratha et al. teach the use of cancelable/recoverable biometrics through the use of perturbations in either the physical space (e.g., a distortion caused by a physical element) or the signal space (e.g., remapping or other nonlinear distortion methods and/or algorithms on the data once captured by the device), as is outlined within the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 above. These methods are inclusive to all biometrics capable of being captured by imaging devices (e.g., fingerprint scanner, iris scanner, voice recorder, or just a camera to capture facial images). However, Ratha et al. fail to teach the use of DNA samples as biometric authentication data.

Despite, Ratha et al. teach the methods used by the instant application for analyzing DNA data without explicitly stating said methods are for DNA sample analysis. The instant application teaches analysis of the DNA sample as a type of bar code, which is to say that its distortion and analysis is contingent with the previously presented biometric distortion and analysis. Please see page 23, lines 4-6 of the instant application. Using a "photograph...bearing a person's DNA sequence (Page 23, lines 8-9)" is the equivalent to all other biometric analysis regarding authentication using distorted biometrics. This is evidenced by "In operation, the person holds the [DNA] carrier next to the camera, the masked pattern is detected, and the person's identification confirmed. (Page 23, lines 13-14)."

Art Unit: 2139

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a DNA sample as an additional biometric to the distorted-biometric authentication system because Ratha et al. state "Although, for illustrative purposes, fingerprint authentication is used throughout, our analysis extends to other biometric-based methods. (Abstract)."

Double Patenting

14. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

15. Claims 1-89 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of copending Application No. 10/748,436. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn

Art Unit: 2139

to biometric distortion for privacy and revocation (or cancellation). An exemplary list of the claim correlation is easily shown comparing claim 58 of the instant application to claim 29 of the copending application, where the instant applications "combination of two or more unique identity attributes" is equivalent to "combining two degrees of uniqueness" of the copending application, and "biometric" & "distortion pattern" (claim 59) are equivalent to "print" & "print modifier" of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

16. Claims 1-89 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-54 of copending Application No. 10/748,435. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to biometric distortion for privacy and revocation (or cancellation). An exemplary list of the claim correlation is easily shown comparing claim 58 of the instant application to claim 1 of the copending application, where there only difference in claim language is "determining" in the instant application was changed to "controlling" in the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

17. Claims 1-89 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of copending Application No. 10/748,743. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

Art Unit: 2139

patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to biometric distortion for privacy and revocation (or cancellation). An exemplary list of the claim correlation is easily shown comparing claim 1 of the instant application to claim 1 of the copending application, where the instant applications "distorted biometric" is equivalent to "distorted print", and the instant applications "comparing..." and "determining..." is equivalent to the copending application's "compares..." and "controls access".

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see PTO-892 form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent L. Williams whose telephone number is 571-270-1376. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00-4:30 with Alternate Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2139

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Williams
3/29/2007

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

